

**LOYLESS
ASSAILS
WATSON'S
MOTIVES
AND
STATEMENTS**

Editor of Augusta
Chronicle

Sets Himself Task of
Ex-
posing Watson's
Misrepre-
sentations Concerning
Slaton

PUBLISHES ARTICLE
OF THREE SOLID
PAGES

Charges Watson Is
Prompted

(Special Dispatch to The Journal.)

AUGUSTA, Ga., Sept. 11.—Under the heading, “Slaton or Watson—Which?” and over his Signature Thomas W. Loyless, Editor and Publisher of *The Augusta Chronicle*, in his paper tomorrow will carry a three-page Article, (twenty-one full Columns) the purpose of which is explained in the last two Paragraphs of the introduction, as follows:

“With this, I fear rather lengthy prelude to what is to follow—but which, I trust, may be excused, in view of the import of the Subject itself to our State and Nation, as well as in view of the magnitude of the Task involved; for we may hardly hope to clear up a full twelve months of continued misrepresentation within the scope of a few Columns of Newspaper Space—I set myself to the Task of fully and completely and convincingly—to all those with an open mind—exposing Thomas E. Watson, and defending and making clear the action and the motives of Ex-Governor Slaton in the Leo Frank Case, well knowing that the former Undertaking, at least, is a thing not to be lightly entered upon; if for no other reason, because it is practically certain to bring down upon me all the misrepresentation, abuse, suspicion and slander that this past Master in vituperation is capable of directing against anyone who has the temerity to take issue with him.”

“Yet, someone must do it, else he will go on undisturbed and uncontradicted in his mad Course of inciting to insurrection, riot and murder—with, possibly, Ex-Governor Slaton as his next victim—so why not I? For I, at least, do not challenge him from a distance; I am not unacquainted with his methods and his motives—and I have in my possession, or immediately available, as much of his highly vulnerable Personal and Political Record as he may care to call for, and can deal it out as rapidly as the occasion

requires; though, I am free to say, I hope to keep the discussion far above that plane.”

WATSON’S MOTIVES.

Mr. Loyless charges that the motives underlying Watson’s campaign against Frank and his persistent attacks on Ex-Governor Slaton were: Watson’s desire to make money by increasing the number of Readers of his Paper, he having exhausted his supply of ammunition in his attacks on Catholicism and Foreign Missions; Watson’s desire to wreak vengeance on Governor Slaton for not having followed his Dictation, and Watson’s desire to rehabilitate a shattered Political influence in State Affairs.

Mr. Loyless takes for the text of his Article the following Extract from a recent Card written by Judge Samuel B. Adams, of Savannah, in Defense of Ex-Governor Slaton’s action in commuting the Sentence of Leo M. Frank:

If Governor Slaton is to be visited with opprobrium for what he did, then every man who urged or requested that he commute the Sentence ought to at least share the Opprobrium.

But his detractors and vilifiers have had their way long enough. It is high time for his Defenders to say something in his behalf, particularly those who urged that he make the Decision that he did make. I cannot, myself, consistently with any Sense of Duty and Right, remain silent longer.

In the course of the introduction of his Article, Mr. Loyless says:

“In making my voluntary contribution to this ‘Defense of Ex-Governor Slaton’ I would be understood, however, seeking to render him no Personal Service—further than he is justly entitled

to at the hands of all those who believe in upholding the Institutions of our State; and, particularly, from those who urged him to the Act which brought down upon him the unreasoning wrath of a misinformed and deliberately misled people—but, rather, in the hope that I may render a Service to my State, which still lies bleeding and torn, humiliated and disgraced before the world, as the Result of the most Devilish Plot that was ever hatched to serve a twofold purpose—wreak vengeance and build up a Political Power.”

“For I can truly say of my own relations with Ex-Governor Slaton, as Judge Adams did, ‘there is no other Special Reason why I should come to the Defense of Governor Slaton. I am under no obligation to him. There is no Special Intimacy between us. I do not live in the same City;’ and I may add that, while in times past I have been his Political Supporter, I owe him nothing, have never asked him for a Political Favor; for myself or others, and have never been offered one. Hence, what I have to say must be taken as a freewill contribution to the cause of Truth and Justice, made of my own volition and without the knowledge of Mr. Slaton or his advisers.

WOULD EXPOSE FALSEHOODS.

“Let them find ‘motive’ in my madness who will; as for myself I merely have the consciousness of performing a Duty. And, if, perchance, others should be moved by the same influences, and by our combined efforts—we should succeed in leading the people back to the light of Reason, while, at the same time, exposing some of the many palpable and infamous falsehoods that have been deliberately injected into this conscienceless Crusade against the Peace and Dignity of our Great Commonwealth—though directed, chiefly, against an

Individual Representative thereof—I, for one, shall feel fully repaid.”

In the exposé of Watson’s misrepresentations, Mr. Loyless begins by reprinting Watson’s comment on the Letter which he (Loyless) wrote to Governor Slaton urging a Commutation for

(Continued on Page 7, Col. 1.)

PDF PAGE 7, COLUMN 1

EDITOR LOYLESS ANSWERS WATSON’S STATEMENTS

(Continued from page one.)

Frank. He quotes Watson’s comment as follows:

The leading Citizens who urged Slaton to intervene were mostly the Lawyers of the Jew-owned L. & N. Railroad System.

The only other leading Citizens that I recall who importuned Slaton were Mr. Thomas Loyless, of the Augusta Chronicle, and Mr. Loyless wrote that he believed Frank to be guilty, but at the request of several friends he would ask the Governor not to allow the Law enforced against this man whom he believed guilty.

Answering this, Mr. Loyless says:

“Now, I respectfully submit, that this is an outrageous perversion of the Truth; and there is no excuse for it, because I published in the Chronicle of May 14, my Letter to the Prison Commission asking Commutation of Frank’s Sentence to life imprisonment, and here is an extract from it:”

Personally, I have always believed, and still believe, Frank to be guilty of the Crime of murder. . . . But I do not know, and no one knows, this to be the Fact beyond a doubt; and I would not send any, white or black, to his death without the practical certainty that he richly deserved such a fate. Moreover, Frank was convicted, largely but not solely, on the unsupported evidence of an admittedly depraved Negro, and under conditions of great Public Excitement—such as are hardly conducive to an entirely fair and proper Administration of Law and Justice.

“Is there anything there about ‘not enforcing the Law,’ just to please my friends? Tom Watson knew there wasn’t when he wrote what he did; but that’s his way of turning spoken or written language to suit his own purposes. He is the most shameless Publisher in that respect, that I have ever known, or heard of.”

“And if he can thus misrepresent me, he can misrepresent you, or Slaton, or Hoke Smith, or Bishop Candler, or anyone else—just as he has done a thousand times, and more.”

10,000 PETITIONED SLATON.

Mr. Loyless points out that there were more than ten thousand leading Georgians who petitioned Governor Slaton to commute Frank’s Sentence, and he lists the names of about a hundred, including a Federal Judge, three Ex-Justices of the State Supreme Court, numerous Superior and City Court Judges, many Lawyers, Bankers, Merchants and Educators.

Referring to this list of names Mr. Loyless says:

“But here are names that ought to strike Tom Watson down—even as Ananias, himself, was stricken—when he cries to make his dupes and followers believe that practically nobody, just ‘mostly L. & N. Lawyers,’ petitioned Governor Slaton to commute Frank’s Sentence:”

“Notable women like Mrs. Walter B. Hill and Miss Mildred Rutherford, of Athens. Miss Celeste Parrish, of the State School Department, and Mrs. E.L. Connally, of Atlanta (Mrs. Connally is the sister of Ex-Governor Brown).”

“Educators like A.W. Van Hoose, of Shorter; President Pearce, of Brenau; Dr. Simmons, of Brenau; Dr. H. C. White, of the University of Georgia.”

“Among the Clergy such notable men as Bishop Warren A. Candler, Rt. Rev. Bishop C.K. Nelson, Bishop Reese, of Savannah; Rev. J.H. Eakes, President Elder at Rome; Rev. Dr. M. Ashby Jones, of Augusta; Rev. C.B. Wilmer, of Atlanta; Dr. John E. White, of Atlanta, and others.”

“Many Superior Court Judges either recommended Commutation or approved the Governor’s action, including such as Henry C. Hamond, of Augusta; Judge Z. A. Littlejohn, of Americus; R.N. Hardeman, of Louisville; Judge Ben H. Hill, of Atlanta, who denied the second motion for new trial, verbally recommended Commutation, as did the late Judge Roan, who denied the first new trial motion. The latter put his recommendation in writing.”

“All told, about 500 Lawyers asked for Commutation of Frank’s Sentence. The opinion that Frank was innocent or that there was serious doubt as to his guilt, held by them, was based in many Cases on a careful study of the Official Record.”

DORSEY'S PARTNER URGED CLEMENCY.

Several of the Letters written by prominent Georgians to Governor Slaton urging him to commute Frank's Sentence are printed in full by Mr. Loyless. Among these are Letters from Colonel P. H. Brewster, a Law Partner of Solicitor Hugh M. Dorsey, and Judge Don A. Pardee, Judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

In part Colonel Brewster's Letter to Governor Slaton was as follows:

"No trial with which I have been acquainted in my Professional life took place where the atmosphere surrounding it was so fearfully charged with these elements, and their influence was so strong as the trial of Leo M. Frank."

"To say the evidence and the verdict was not affected by this influence, with which the very atmosphere was full, is idle."

"Every witness who testified did so under this influence, and no Juror escaped it. During the whole trial, the populace gathered in the Streets about the place the trial was being conducted, often in great numbers, giving manifestations in unmistakable utterances of the Universal sentiment, 'Hang him.'"

"To try a man charged with such a heinous Crime, when surrounded with such an atmosphere leaves him, guilty or not guilty, no hope."

"I am quite familiar with the Official record in this Case. Outside of the testimony of the Negro, Jim Conley, it is my Opinion that there is not evidence sufficient to support the verdict. In fact, there is no evidence but that of Conley, which is not perfectly consistent with Frank's innocence. But when the character of

Conley and the methods employed to secure his Statements are considered, it does seem to me his testimony is of no value."

"Therefore, I am thoroughly convinced that Frank is innocent. I would not be willing, as a Citizen of Georgia, to have the State put this man to death."

"What I say is not intended to criticize Lawyers who were engaged in this Case, Courts which have considered it, or the Jurors who rendered the verdict."

"I have no possible interest in the Case, except as a Citizen."

JUDGE PARDEE'S LETTER.

After stressing the Opinion of the two Justices of the State Supreme Court who dissented when that Tribunal denied Frank's motion for a new trial and declaring that "no Governor could well hesitate to grant a Commutation unless on investigation he should come to be fully satisfied that the accused was guilty and that the dissenting Judges were in error," Judge Pardee, in his Letter to Governor Slaton, said:

"But, in the Frank Case, I go further. I was in and about Atlanta at the time of the homicide and during part of the trial, and know something of the outside Circumstances attending the same; and have no doubt whatever that the Public Feeling against Frank, outwardly expressed in the City and about the Courthouse, was incompatible with a fair trial, and this when taken in connection with the action of the Judge in recommending that Counsel for Frank be absent from the Court Room when the verdict should be rendered and in permitting the verdict without the presence of Frank, seems to me a very important consideration decidedly affecting the question of commutation."

“Further than this, I do not believe Frank is guilty. The man who wrote the notes found near the body of Mary Phagan was inevitably Particeps Criminis in the murder. James Conley admits writing those notes. To clear himself, he implicated Frank as Principal and himself as merely Assistant. To my mind, his story is not supported by any satisfactory corroborative evidence, and, with its glaring contradictions, it is incredible and wholly unworthy of Belief.”

“Under all the Circumstances attending the trial of the Frank Case, the State of Georgia cannot well afford to have the Penalty of Death inflicted.”

ROAN LETTER GENUINE.

Mr. Loyless pays particular attention to the famous Judge Roan Letter, which Watson has openly charged was a forgery, and he publishes Affidavits from the Stenographer to whom Judge Roan dictated the Letter, and from Dr. Wallace E. Brown, Proprietor of the Sanitarium in North Adams, Mass., where Judge Roan was a patient at the time. Both swear that Judge Roan dictated the Letter and signed it with his own hand, and Dr. Brown swears that Judge Roan was mentally responsible when he dictated and signed the Letter. Dr. Brown also swears that Judge Roan had told him previously that he was not convinced of Frank's guilt and that if he ever made an Application for Executive Clemency he (Judge Roan) intended to recommend a Commutation.

The Roan Letter, addressed to Frank's Counsel, is carried in full in Mr. Loyless Article. An extract from it follows:

It is possible that I showed undue deference to the Opinion of the Jury in this Case when I allowed their verdict to stand. They said by their verdict that they had found the

Truth was still in a state of uncertainty, and so expressed Myself. My search for the truth though diligent and earnest, had not been so successful. In the exercise of Judicial Discretion, restricted and limited, according to my interpretation of the Decisions of the Reviewing Courts, I allowed the Jury's verdict to remain undisturbed. I had no way of knowing it was erroneous.

After many months of continued deliberation, I am still uncertain of Frank's guilt. This state of uncertainty is largely due to the character of the Negro Conley's testimony, by which the verdict was evidently reached.

Therefore, I consider this is a Case in which the Chief Magistrate of the State should exert every effort in ascertaining the Truth. The Execution of any person whose guilt has not been satisfactorily proven to the constituted Authorities is too horrible to contemplate. I do not believe that a person should meet with the extreme Penalty of the Law until the Court, Jury and Governor shall have been satisfied of that person's guilt. Hence, at the proper time, I shall express and enlarge upon these views directly to the Governor and the Prison Commission.

However, if for any cause, I am prevented from doing this, you are at Liberty to use the Letter at the Hearing.

AFFIDAVITS ATTEST LETTER.

The Affidavits, attesting the genuineness of the Roan Letter which Mr. Loyless states were obtained by the City Attorney of North Adams, Mass., are given as follows:

Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Berkshire Hills Sanatorium

Personally appeared before the undersigned authority, Mrs. Wallace E. Brown, who, being duly sworn, deposes and says on Oath, that on Sunday, November 29, Judge L. S. Roan, of Atlanta, Ga., dictated to her, read and signed in her presence a Letter, an exact Copy of which is as follows: (Here follows Copy of Judge Roan's Letter.)

When Judge Roan began dictating the Letter herein before set out, Deponent asked him if he wished it to be dated on Sunday. He remarked that it was immaterial, but probably she had better date it as of the next day. Deponent was under the impression that Sunday, November 29, 1914, was November 30, and therefore undertook, to date the Letter, December 1, 1914. Deponent, on consulting the Calendar, finds that the Sunday on which the Letter was written was November 29th instead of November 30th. The cause of the day of the month not appearing in the Letter is due to an oversight of Deponent.

Before and after November 29th, Judge Roan dictated numerous Business Letters to Deponent, and frequently in her presence, wrote Letters to his wife in his own hand. At the time, Judge Roan was at the Berkshire Hills Sanatorium, Deponent was Private Secretary to Wallace E. Brown, Proprietor and Owner of said Sanatorium, in which Capacity she had served for seventeen years. Since that time she has become the wife of Dr. Brown, and is now a Resident at the Sanatorium, North Adams, Mass.

(Signed)

WALLACE E. BROWN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this fourth day of August, 1915, at North Adams, Mass.

(Signed)

C. T. PHELPS,

(Seal)

Notary Public.

With Reference to the Roan Letter and the Affidavits attesting its genuineness, Mr. Loyless says:

“In the above list, I mentioned the name of the late Judge Roan—who presided at the Frank trial—as having written a Letter to Governor Slaton asking him to commute Frank’s Sentence on the ground of ‘reasonable doubt.’”

WATSON’S CRUELTY.

“There isn’t the slightest doubt about the genuineness of that Letter—the solemn message of a dying man—but Tom Watson is cruel enough to say Judge Roan didn’t dictate and sign any such Letter; that it is a ‘forgery’ and all that; and he has repeated this infamous charge over and over again so often that maybe he has come to believe it himself, though I doubt if he does.”

“Fortunately, Affidavits of the Doctor who attended him and the Nurse who heard him dictate the Letter and saw him sign, are in existence. Mrs. Roan also declares that she knows he signed it. And in the face of such testimony, it would seem that even a Tom Watson might be shamed into silence; but he isn’t. So let’s let him have his say; listen:”

“A forged Letter was produced nearly three months after Judge Roan died, and this forged Letter did not even have a date.

It purported to have been written in December, 1914, when Judge Roan could not hold a pen nor dictate a Letter.

That smooth Document with Judge Roan’s stenciled Signature was manufactured in Atlanta, by a very smooth Lawyer.

“I could fill this whole page with similar ravings from Watson—worse even than these—about this one thing alone, the Roan Letter; the burden of his cry being that Mr. John W. Moore, a thoroughly reputable Atlanta Lawyer—and who had previously represented Watson as an Attorney—is responsible for this ‘forgery.’ But I won’t; rather will I merely submit the Proof of the genuineness of the Roan Letter—though nobody ever pretended to doubt its genuineness till Watson took it up—proof that would be accepted as conclusive in any Court of Justice in the world.”

JUDGE HILL’S LETTER.

Mr. Loyless prints a Copy of a Letter written by Judge Ben H. Hill, of the Fulton Superior Court, demanding that Watson correct a misstatement which he had made in his Publication to the effect that Governor Slaton had demanded of Judge Hill that he fix a date for Frank’s Execution which would necessitate Frank’s Petition for Executive Clemency coming to him (Slaton).

Judge Hill’s Letter is given as follows:

Fulton Superior Court,
City Court of Atlanta,
Criminal Court of Atlanta.

Arnold Broyles, Clerk,

Atlanta, Ga., July 31, 1915.

Hon. Thomas E. Watson,

Editor The Jeffersonian,

Thomson, Ga.

Dear Sir: My attention has been called to the following extract which appeared in the Jeffersonian of Thursday, July 15th, 1915.

“I am informed that the ‘Judge’ who sentenced Frank the last time suggested the same thing to Slaton, and offered to fix the date of Frank’s Execution so that Governor Harris would have to pass on the Application for Clemency; and that Slaton said ‘No.’ He demanded that the Case come before him.”

I am the “Judge” referred to. The information given you was not only incorrect but without the slightest foundation in truth. I never spoke to Governor Slaton on the Subject of fixing the date for the Execution of the Sentence of Leo M. Frank. It would never occur to me to seek the advice or to accept suggestions from the Executive as to the exercise of my Judicial Functions. Neither Governor Slaton, nor any friend of his, ever spoke a word to me on the Subject of fixing the date for the Execution of Frank’s Sentence.

The only man who ever did, at any time speak to me on the Subject, was the Solicitor General, and he did so in the line of his Official Duty, without making any suggestions as to the date for the Execution of the Sentence.

In fixing the date, I acted entirely upon my own initiative and responsibility, selecting the medium between the Maximum and the Minimum dates, under the Statute, as I had done on previous occasions, and I did this on the last occasion regardless of the personnel of the Governor who might have the responsibility of passing upon any future Application for Executive Clemency.

Kindly insert foregoing in next issue of the Jeffersonian.

Yours truly,

(Signed)

B.H. HILL

Judge Superior

Court

Replying to Watson's oft-Repeated charge that Governor Slaton was a Law Partner of Luther Z. Rosser, one of Frank's Attorneys; that he shared in the fees received by Rosser and that he was therefore disqualified to pass upon Frank's Petition, Mr. Loyless states that the Firms of Rosser & Brandon and Slaton & Phillips were not consolidated until two months after Mr. Rosser had been employed to represent Frank; that the consolidation contract of the Firms provided that neither was to share in the fees of Cases in the hands of the other at the time of the consolidation and that Governor Slaton was not to share at all in the earnings of the consolidated Firm during the time he was Governor.

It is pointed out that neither officially nor unofficially was the disqualification point ever made upon Governor Slaton until after he had commuted the Sentence of Frank. On this, Mr. Loyless says:

"If a matter is before any tribunal and there is any possible ground for urging Disqualification, the time to urge this, is before the Hearing begins or during the Hearing, if it should develop. What Fact did Solicitor Dorsey have after the Hearing before Governor Slaton, that he did not have before or during the same, that justified him, an Officer of the Law, in impugning the motives of the Governor of the State? If he really believed that Disqualification existed, it was his Duty to have urged it before the Decision, not after."

"Can anyone doubt that had such a point been then raised by the Official whose duty it was to make it, if he believed it

existed, Governor Slaton would have gladly acquiesced and declined to hear the Case? This was the only honorable excuse he could have given, for passing the Case to his Successor, Governor Harris, and burdening the latter with a Case that would create enemies, no matter what the Decision might have been. Had he passed it otherwise, he would have been branded as a coward, and it is Publicly Charged that Newspaper Cartoons were in existence ready to be printed so branding him, had he pressed it to his Successor—that famous unprinted Cartoon, picturing Slaton with ‘feathers on his legs.’”

“And, furthermore,” declares Mr. Loyless, “as I know the ways of Georgians, I know of none who is denouncing him on the Score of the Law Firm who would not be denouncing him just as severely if there had been no Law Firm connection. It’s merely an excuse; not a Reason; and proves that his Detractors lack good Reason for denouncing him.

HOW CASE REACHED SLATON.

Taking up Watson’s frequent charge that Frank’s friends hurried his Case through the Courts in Order to get it to Slaton before his term expired Mr. Loyless, after touching on the Final Appeal to the Federal Supreme Court, and that tribunal’s adverse Decision, says:

“The Defense announced there would be no further Proceedings in the Courts, but made no move to have the Mandate hurried. There was a suspicious note in the subsequent comment. If they are through, it was said, why do they delay the finish on a mere technicality? Why don’t they go up there and ask for the Mandate and show they haven’t been proceeding merely for delay?”

“It was openly asserted that Frank’s Lawyers were maneuvering the Proceedings in order to get the Case before Governor-Elect Harris—asserted from Quarters where Governor Slaton has been most viciously denounced for not forcing the Case on Harris.”

“On May 3, the Attorneys for the Defense having made no move to have the Mandate issue, Solicitor Dorsey presented a Petition to Judge Hill, of the Georgia Superior Court, asking that Frank be summoned and sentenced regardless of the United States Supreme Court Mandate.”

“Thus, at this point, the first move to hurry the Case so that it would reach Slaton was made by the Prosecution. Judge Hill, of course, denied the Petition.”

“Dorsey is reputed a good Lawyer and, if he is, he must have known that Frank could not be sentenced so long as he was in the hands, though only technically, of the Federal Courts. Assuming that Dorsey knew the Law, there are two deductions which may be made: First, he may have wished to put the burden for delay on the Defense, for by its consent the Mandate could issue; second, he wanted the Case to reach Slaton.”

“Dorsey’s action had the effect, whether intended or not, of putting the burden, in the Public mind, on the Defense.”

“So, on May 5, Louis Marshall, representing the Defense, appeared before the Supreme Court and consented for the Mandate to issue.”

“The Mandate reached Atlanta on May 6 and was made the Judgment of the District Court (Judge Newman having been out of town on its arrival) on May 8, which was Saturday.”

“On May 10, Dorsey appeared before Judge Hill and asked that Frank be sentenced, and Frank was sentenced to be executed on June 21, four days before the Expiration of Slaton’s term.”

“Judge Hill states over his Signature that the only person who discussed with him any Feature relating to the sentence was the Solicitor.”

“The Record shows that the first and most persistent efforts to hurry the Case, were made by the Solicitor.”

“The truth is,” says Mr. Loyless. “Frank’s enemies were anxious for Slaton to pass upon the Case, for they didn’t believe he had the nerve to commute the Sentence.”

NOTHING TO GAIN.

Asserting that Governor Slaton had everything to lose and nothing to gain, by letting the Frank Case reach him, Mr. Loyless says:

“Let me summarize the situation as Slaton could not help seeing, as I am sure he did see it:”

“1. Commutation of Frank’s Sentence could not redound to Slaton’s pecuniary interests, but on the contrary, would injure them.”

“2. Commutation of Frank’s Sentence might be virtual Political Suicide. His Political Ambition was his chief passion, and his prospects were the best.”

“3. Frank’s Commutation meant Personal danger and great embarrassment to both himself and family.”

“4. Frank’s Commutation probably meant lasting misunderstanding as to his motives.”

“Thus, knowing all these things, he acted on the Case when he could have passed it to his Successor, because he felt that to dodge it would be unjustifiable cowardice; he commuted the sentence because he thought it his duty to do so.”

“You find such examples of courage and fidelity to duty in books, but rarely ever in real life.”

Mr. Loyless prints a sketch of Governor Slaton’s Private and Public Life and takes occasion to pay him a tribute as being “one of the most honest, one of the most scrupulous, and I am now glad to say, one of the most courageous” of the many Public and Semi-Public men he has known.

After citing a number of instances of Governor Slaton’s uprightness and honesty and his Service to the State Mr. Loyless says:

“But there is still another reason why I know Slaton is an honest man, and it is this:”

“Tom Watson couldn’t bribe him, or tempt him—and Watson knows he tried.”

“Yet, Watson has, heretofore, found no such difficulty with the average Public Man in Georgia. He has, from time to time, led lots of them up to a high mountain—only to pitch them off in the end.”

“But long ago, when he found out that he couldn’t control Slaton, he turned against him with all the venom of the Watson nature.”

“He was so anxious to have his way about the Frank Case, however, that he buried his pride and tried again. And this is the way he went about it. Read it, you Georgians who are jealous of the honor and integrity of your State and of its Public Men—and

choose ye between Tom Watson and Jack Slaton for integrity and decency:"

"About a week before Slaton rendered his Decision in the Frank Case, and while the Hearing of the Petition to commute was still in progress, Tom Watson sent Governor Slaton word through a mutual friend that if the Governor would let Leo Frank hang, he (Watson) would be Slaton's 'friend for life,' and that it would result 'in Slaton becoming United States Senator' next time, and the Master of Georgia Politics for twenty years to come."

"Of course, Slaton spurned the suggestion, as promptly as he would have spurned an offer of money—for it meant that he should sacrifice a human life for the sake of his Political Ambition."

"I dare Watson to deny this, for I have the proof of it in my possession; and he knows the man by whom I can prove it."

THE GLOVER CASE.

Mr. Loyless cites the famous Glover Case to show that in that Case, Watson insisted on Governor Hoke Smith doing what he now condemns Governor Slaton for having done. In this connection Mr. Loyless says:

"I have said elsewhere in this Article that this same Tom Watson, on one occasion, tried to get Governor Hoke Smith to do the very thing he has so bitterly condemned Governor Slaton for doing—commute the murderer of a defenseless Factory girl."

"It was in the year 1906. The murderer was one Arthur Glover, one of Watson's henchmen. Glover's victim was Maud Williamson, a working-girl employed in the Sibley Mills, Augusta, and who had refused to continue her relations with Glover."

“The latter, a man with faithful wife and young children, invaded the Sibley Mill and shot this poor, defenseless woman in the back. Then, when she fell to her knees and began to beg piteously for her life, he shot her again, and again, till she was dead.”

“Glover was tried and promptly convicted. Then, Watson came into the Case—ostensibly on the ground that Glover was his ‘friend’ and once saved Watson’s life at a political meeting in Augusta, many years ago.”

“Watson advised Glover’s Leading Counsel, Messrs. A.L. Franklin and C.A. Picquet, of Augusta, to try to ‘keep the Case in the Courts till Hoke Smith was inaugurated as Governor.’”

“Watson had strongly supported Hoke Smith in his race, and said he could depend upon him. He afterwards claimed that Hoke Smith ‘promised’ him that he would do as he asked and commute Glover.”

“But Governor Smith did no such thing—although he knew his refusal to do so would bring down upon his head all of Watson’s unreasoning wrath—for to commute Glover would have been to ‘Rape the Law’ as it has never been raped in Georgia.”

“Glover was duly executed—and everyone knows what happened after that. Watson immediately turned upon Hoke Smith, and has abused and slandered him ever since as he has abused and slandered no other man except Governor Slaton.”

“And the worst of it is, Tom Watson tried to secure a fee—and I think, did secure a part of it—for thus trying to save the life of his cold-blooded murderer, the man whom he called his ‘friend,’ and who, he said, in his personal plea to Governor Smith, once ‘saved his (Watson’s) life.’”

“How do you like it—you Georgians who have been so blindly following Tom Watson’s lead in his blind hatred of Ex-Governor Smith and, now, Ex-Governor Slaton. Can you go further with him?”

MEANT MONEY FOR WATSON.

Just how Watson has employed the Frank Case to more than treble the Circulation of his Paper and to increase his income is told by Mr. Loyless in the following:

“The first mention I find of the Frank Case in one of his Papers is in April, 1914. At that time, the Circulation of his Jeffersonian had “slumped” considerably. He had worn the Catholic issue threadbare. He had rung every change on the “Roman Catholic Hierarchy,” the Priesthood, the Sisterhood and everything in connection with this great religious denomination; even going so far as to deal in obscenity, to an extent that finally brought him within the toils of the Law.”

“His Readers, naturally, grew tired of hearing him play so long on one string; every issue of his Paper was but a repetition of the last. He realized that he was “running out of ‘soap,’—and he had to have a new issue. It was here that he took up the Frank Case, and since that time, the Circulation of his Jeffersonian has grown by leaps and bounds. From less than 25,000 Circulation weekly, it has grown to 87,000—this being the number of copies printed by him for the week ending September 4th.”

“Not only has the Frank Case given him this enormous increase in Circulation, but it has enabled him to raise the price of his Paper. I am informed that he formerly sold it to Newsdealers and Newsboys at one cent per Copy, and afterward 1 1-2 cents per Copy. He has very recently given notice of a raise in price to two cents per Copy.”

“Thus, has he not only more than trebled his Circulation, by exploiting the Frank Case, but has doubled the price of his Product. From a gross income about a year ago, as I figure it, of not more than \$300 per week, exclusive of advertising—and his Paper carried precious little of that—his last week’s issue must have brought him in not less than \$1,740. All on account of the Frank Case.”

A STINGING ARRAIGNMENT.

Mr. Loyless concludes his Article with this stinging arraignment, of Watson:

“There may be, and I have no doubt there are, many men in Georgia and elsewhere, who will be unable to understand how any man could be willing to carry on a work of this sort for money—even to increase his income eight times over. But such men do not understand Tom Watson. He has but three controlling passions—bitterness, born of Political Disappointments; hate, engendered by his attitude toward the world, and the world’s attitude toward him; exaggerated ego, causing him to seek notoriety in any and every way possible; and avarice—money to him being the greatest god of all.”

“If this is not a fair estimate of his motives and his character, then many of the best people of Thomson, themselves his neighbors—and his friends, before he put himself beyond the pale of friendship—have utterly failed to know him for what he is, and have slandered him indeed.”

Journal's Defense of the South.

(From the New York Evening Post.)

An eloquent Defense of the South against Northern critics who have been betrayed by their indignation over the Frank lynching into sweeping denunciation, is made by *The Atlanta Journal*. The latter, on its part, goes a bit too far in citing bomb outrages in this City as in some sort parallel to mob activities on the other side of the Mason and Dixon line. Horrible as these outrages are, they lack the Feature that provokes outside excoriation of lynchings, and that is endorsement and attempted Defense of these illegal Executions by the localities where they occur. Nobody defends bomb explosions, except the misguided few who resort to them as a method of Private Vengeance, and a circle, also small, of Anarchist Agitators, sometimes posing as Advance Agents of Social Justice. The Journal is upon firmer ground when it recalls lynchings in the North, for these, like those elsewhere, have been defended by the Communities disgraced by them. But the part of *The Journal's* Defense of its Homeland that will arouse sympathetic assent the Country over, is its vindication of Georgia from the Charge of being a "reproach and a danger to the American Republic." *The Journal* repels the Imputation of unworthiness in Language that suggests Grady, and, like his, undoubtedly embodies the best sentiment not only of Georgia, but of the entire South."

"No people without a profound regard for Law and Government, no people without rare gifts of mind and heart, could ever have plucked such wonderful prosperity from

overwhelming Disaster. . . .Georgia and the South have their peculiar problems, as does every part of the Union, their blunderings and failures and shames. But they have also their Ideals, and Achievements, and Brave resolves. Their mistreadings, in the Main, are those of rash impulse rather than of sordid Iniquity. They are not a Province, but a responsive, loyal part of the Nation. They are proud to be Southerners, prouder still to be Americans; and in this Spirit, while despising their Defamers, they rejoice in their National Brotherhood.”

PDF PAGE 6, COLUMN 7

“Sectionalism”

(From the New York Commercial.)

Condemnation of mob violence in Georgia is degenerating into frank and indiscriminating abuse. Generally speaking, the Newspapers of the Country, including those published in the Southern States, have dealt with the Frank Case in a Judicial way, as was proper. A few persist in libeling the whole South, as if one-third of the population of the United States had taken part in committing the outrage. The civilized world stood aghast with horror when Prussian Militarism destroyed Louvain and massacred noncombatants because someone fired a shot at a German Trooper. Similar “Prussianism” inspires those newspapers which attack the whole South because a Crime was committed that remains unpunished.

Journalism recognizes certain Ethical Rules that govern criticism and apply to all that is spoken, written or printed. In Dramatic Art, for instance, it is legitimate to portray a Priest or a

Soldier as a villain, but he must not stand as the Prototype of his Profession and no inference must be raised that all Priests or Soldiers are villains. Neither must a crooked Yankee be used to represent the average New Englander. Whole Races, Nations and Creeds have been attacked in this way since the beginning of history, so the sin is not new, but the world has outgrown it and its recrudescence in certain Newspapers is inexcusable.

Sectionalism has always been the weakness of the United States, but it is gradually dying out. It has cost us enough already and only an Enemy of this Country would seek to revive it. Too much "hyphenism" has cropped out on account of the war in Europe, but it is as nothing when compared with sectionalism that treats whole States as Pariahs. In our great Cities, not one murderer in ten is punished and Criminals are protected from Prosecution by the cowardice of those who know them; but these Cities are not given over to Lawlessness and murder, and the vast majority of their Citizens are courageous and Law-abiding. Within a week, three startling murders have been committed not far from New York that bear all the evidences of premeditation and of the participation of several persons, but these Cases do not prove that the Eastern States are given over to organized Bands of Assassins with the consent of the people, any more than that the whole South is guilty. If the Authorities in Georgia have failed to secure proofs in the Frank Case, the Police of New York City have also failed in dozens of Murder Cases when a neighborhood of Foreigners was terrorized. Only when the people trust the Officers of the Law and the Courts, and feel that Justice will be speedy and protection, sure will these evils be abated. This Country needs Reform along these lines but Reform will never come from Sectionalism.
